G.R.S. IX—5]

Previous references.

1922.

(Madurai)

File No. 211-1922

Serial Nos. 2—6

Later references.

GENERAL AND REVENUE SECRETARIAT.

Serial Nos. 5

Part B for October 1923

SUBJECT

Appeal petition of Pandit Thiruvalacheri Archak of Sri Soundaravadeeswara and Anjaneya temples at Kedalapur, Arkalgud Taluq—

No. 542 dated 22.10.1923. To the Revg Comr

As this is only an appeal against a disciplinary order of punishment, the Revg. Comr may entertain the appeal and dispose of the same

29/11/1923

T. R. S. 11] 1922

GENERAL AND REVENUE SECRETARIAT.

(Inwz)

NOTES.

File No. 211/1922.

FILE HEADING.

Archakaship of Sri Srinivasa Perumal and Anjaneya temples at Kovalapur in the Nirmal Sub Dist.

From

Pandit Jeevanlacharya of Kovalapur

No. Petition Dated 22.9.1922 Received 12.10.1922

Diary No. 1076 Enclos. 2 Spare Copies. — Serial No. 1

BRIEF ABSTRACT OF LETTER.

Appeals against the Dy Comrs order placing the Archaka-ship under suspension for 2 years and prays for a stay under pending the appeal to continue to perform the duties of his

NOTES AND ORDERS.

and to be in possession of the estate concerned.

1. The petition is duly Stamped. Copy

2. The order appealed against a copy of which has been filed is

3

NOTES—First Sheet.

R. S. III-21

General and Revenue Secretariat.

File No. 211 of 19 22

Serial No.

The appeal petition, is dated 30-8-1922, while the appeal petition was received on 30.8.22

The grounds for appeal are summarized in the petition.

2 The complaints against the appellant against whom the orders appealed against, are that he is an Ayurvedic Pandit and cannot find time to attend his duties, that on a remedy his cancellorness, there was hoff in his practice, a Devara Vigraha. The basis for cost of which has not been made good, that his character is not satisfactory that he is indebted to the appellant in the sum of [illegible] petition amount.

3 [illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

12/10/22

NOTE—Contn. sheet.

1026

J. R. S. III-21

General and Revenue Secretariat. | Mug File No. 211 of 1922

Serial No.	
	5 A letter may be called for (First Member) from Mundy. 21/10/22
3238-257 16.10.22	6 A. approved Rec. 16/10/22
	8 Secy 21/10/22
2	To The Mug. Commr in Mysore. No. 1639 & 78 Dated 6th Oct 22 calls for report in the (illegible) Mundy.
3.	From, the Mug. Commr Letter no. C 574 Dated 31st Jany 23 Submits report with reference called for in Sl. 2. The facts of the case are recorded in the Dy. Comrs order appealed against. The grounds on which the appellant bases his appeal [illegible] to see

NOTE—Contn. sheet.

R. S. III-21

General and Revenue Secretariat. | MWB File No. M of 1972

Serial No.

W D
(appeal petition)

Summarized in para 2 - He prays for a cancellation of this order for the following among other grounds. - -

(i) he is not under an obligation to perform rajya in the Sonitpur Deputy Commissioner's Tenure but the local authorities including the Dy. Comr. are of opinion that he should work here also in addition to Nyamaya Darbar as a separate warrant can not be issued for the former in Sth, Sonitpur Tenure).

(ii) he has made any representation for the value of the property taken from the Nyamaya Darbar - Tenure, which by ~~that~~ is not impossible reason for the non-payment of the Dy. Comr. that he has not made for the value.

(iii) the fact of his practising Ayurveda for nearly 30 years & end of service, i.e. for nearly two years, from the date he could not intercede him [illegible]

NOTE—Contn. sheet.

G. R. S. III-2.

General and Revenue Secretariat.

File No. VM of 19 V.2

Serial No.

that it is true that his Agnivedic duties interfere with duties.

(IV). he complains that a majority of Centres have not Complied against him, as required by the Mun. Regn for his removal, now the office says that the Commissioner must bring in a Bill to this effect & to do this Bill between the two Councils. The Dy Comr reports that - persons might be the office of Pujari & Anjaneya Swami Temple is itself called in question the Madras a decision is not now necessary. The office is not included from -

SG 10/2/23

Who has been appointed as Pujari of the Sreeram Devasthanam Temple? Also the Temple been brought with Inam and who is managing it?

NOTE—Contn. sheet

G. R. S. III-2

General and Revenue Secretariat.

File No. 211 of 19 22

Serial No.

12 When did the theft take place in the Sreerangam Ranga Temple? What were the things stolen and what was their value? Who are the office holders in the temple? When was appellant ordered to make good the loss? Is appellant at least the Dharmakartha Trustee of the Ranganatha Temple? Have Regd. Trustees of the trustees of the temple agreed to his continuance in office and have they agreed to pay him Commission for his removal?

13 How can he further appeal pending appeal and how can he be taken on Record?

U.S. 10/2/23

14 Information not available. Office existing Orders to be passed

M 20.2.23 BG 20/2/23

(S) First Member 20.2.23

NOTE—Contn. sheet.

G. R. S. III-21

General and Revenue Secretariat.

File No. 211 of 19 23

7025-716
26.2.23

Serial No.

16

I do not know why this has been put up. There was no need to get the members approval to the non-post up.

Secy
27.2.23 - 4/27/2/23

17

May this Dept receive?

18 Sec 28/2/23

I by mistake did the Dept & the member because the enquiry proposed pertains to the nature of a grant.

19 Secy 4/3/23

3

No 2611 dt 3/2/23 to the Govt Comm.

Requests to furnish certain information re the Affairs of the Temple -

Secy 4.

From, The Imperial Comm.
Letter no. C.516 dt 28.7.23

Submits the report called for in Sl. 3.

NOTE—Contn. sheet.

Muzrai Secretariat | Muz. File No. 211 of 1922.

Serial No.	
B	20 The Dy. Comm'r's. communication Dy 16th July 1923 gives full information on the queries in Sl. 3.
	(q. i) The theft took place on 10th May 1921 and the Archak brought it to the notice of the Taluk authorities on 14th September 1921.
	(q. ii). Silver Hasta and other articles valued at Rs 85-8-0 were stolen
	(q. iii). The Archak is the only servant of the temple. It is said that no orders were issued to the appellant to make good the loss of the articles.
	(q. iv). It is reported that the appellant is not the karanam but pujari of the temple

NOTE—Contn. sheet

WD 0561—GPB—3750—1-8 22

G. R. S. III-2]

Muzrai Secretariat | Muz. File No. 211 of 1924

Serial No.

It is stated that on the death of one Thimmaraiu about 15 years back, Tirumalachar, the appellant, took up the Services in the temple from the year 1908.

(Q.I). Excluding 24 persons who are Veerashaivas, 27 persons being Brahmans and Smarta devotees of the temple, pray for the removal of the appellant, while 25 persons who are non-Brahmans desire his continuance.

(Q.II). As the apltt is not the Baramane Pujari eli, they are unwilling to pay compensation.

The appellant says that he has been practising Ayurveda from a long time, while the villagers say that he has been

NOTE—Contn sheet

WD 0561—GPB—3750—1 8 22

G R. S. III.2]

Muzrai Secretariat | Muz. File No. 211 of 1922

Serial No.

practising it for the last 8 years.

Submitted for orders.

AG 31.7.23. The investigation conducted by the Muzrai Department, the Amildar's report dated the 28th Feby. 1918, the Muzrai Inspr's opinion on the scale of fees proposed by the local Officers and the Dy Comrs remarks thereto, all point to the fact that the Sri Anjaneya Swami is the Principal deity in the compound of which the Srinivasa Devaru & Alarulu Varadaraja Swamies were recently constructed and entrusted to the Pujari Thirumalachar, the present appellant. The appellant has been conducting worship in the temples for several years past, and as the archak is primarily responsible under Standing orders for loss of articles in the temples in his charge

NOTE—Contn. sheet

WD 0561—GPB—3750—1 8 22

G. R. S III. 2]

Muzrai Secretariat | Muz. File No. 211 of 1922-23

Serial No.

he cannot now divest himself of his responsibility in the matter ~~exercised~~ by saying that the Srinivasa Devaru is not a Muzrai Inspm. No' it is not a Muzrai Inspm. if (remained after) he is attached to a Muzrai Inspm. and he has been doing puja in it.

23 Apart from this point the Executive Committee of the temple and the Dharmadarsi ~~Dharmadarsi~~ Manager (12.7.21) say that his character is bad and that this has prevented many devotees from going to the temple for Nitya Utsava.

pp 114 of the Manual.

An instance of such disqualification are laid down in G.O. No 113-25 dated the 28th Feb. 1892 (Civil) printed on page 114 of the Muzrai Manual. According to this order even a hereditary archak loses his hereditary claim to archakship for proved bad character.

24 His practising Ayurvedic treatment of medicine does not go much against him as he might have it as a subsidiary occupation to his

NOTE—Contn sheet

WD 0961—GPB—3750—J 9 22

G. R. S. III-2]

General and Revenue Secretariat.

Mez File No. 211 of 1922-23

Serial No.

Vs H-ri further reported that the appellant has been doing the duties of archak since 1908 after the death of one Nimmanaraya, Banavarivaru archak

Vs. For these reasons, the Order of the Dy Com^r seems to be quite right & reasonable, the appellant may be informed that [illegible] has no power to interference with the order of the Dy Com^r.

77
5 8 23

Dy. 27) 2nd Member) dcs 3/8/23

7/8/23

28) As this is not an appeal against a disciplinary order of punishment & is not in the Mez Com^r competent to entertain the appeal, dismiss it

dcs 7-8-23

29) As this is a disciplinary order, the Mez. Com^r will be asked to entertain the appeal and dispose of it.

Submitted for orders with reference to A[illegible]

9.8.23.

NOTE—Cover sheet.

Serial No.

30) Reading Chapter IV of the Muzrai Regulation dealing with the hereditary servants of temples, with the schedule of powers vested in the Mus Comr., it seems plain that the disciplinary action of the Mus: Officer does not come within the purview of the Regulation in so far as an appeal against his orders [illegible] being preferred to Govt. sanctioned by Govt.

31) Draft expressing the view of the Mus Comr

or orders.

(RL 2nd member) dcg 9/8/23

9/8/23

25.
10-8-23

32) Draft copy
That may be done.

33) (Cl 6 to be rejected when Mus was not [illegible] matter [illegible] to such terms & Labor MS have been worked out in case with Secretariat)

RL
18/8/23

dcg 24/8/23

542

NOTE—Contn. sheet

WD 0361—GPB—3750—1 8 22

Muzrai Secretariat

Muz. File No. 211 of 192 2

Serial No.	
b	States that the Commissioner may entertain the appeal and dispose of same

NOTE—Contn. sheet

WD 0561—GPB—1750—1 8 22

G. R. S. VI—G/32]

SUBJECT.....

.....

.....

*Diary No. of letter replied to*_____

General and Revenue Secretariat

( )

, *the* *191*

Section Misc 3

File No.

Serial No 2

No 639
Focus

Date of issue 28.10.22

To

The Insp. Genl

Signed by Mr. T.E.J. Piggott Esq,

I am directed to forward herewith for favour of return with regd. no. 1026 [illegible]

over.

List of enclosures.

Copied by

Examined by

29854

C 574 of 22-23

Enclosure file

Office of the Muzrai Commissioner in Mysore,

Dated, Bangalore, the 25th January 1923.

From

V. Chanly, Esquire, B.A.,

Muzrai Commissioner in Mysore.

To

T.E. Jayaram Aiyar, Esq., B.A., B.L.,

Secretary to the Government of His Highness

the Maharaja of Mysore, Revenue Department.

Sir,

With reference to your letter No. 1630/ Ex.311-22-9 dated 28th October 1922 calling for a detailed report with the connected records on the appeal petition of Ranjit Tirumalachar, archak of the Sri Srinivasa alias Venkataramana temple at Kasaba in Arsikere Taluk, appealing against the Deputy Commissioner's Order placing the aforesaid archak under suspension for two years, I have the honor to submit herewith copy of Deputy Commissioner's letter No. 348-30/H.C. dated 30th January 1923 and the entire records received therewith.

The facts of the case are detailed in the Deputy Commissioner's order on the appeal preferred before him and enclosed in the file.

I have the honor to be,

Sir,

Your most obedient servant,

V. Chanly

Muzrai Commissioner.

Muz 4]

Letter No.848-22/M.C. dated 23rd January 1923 from the Deputy Commissioner, Hassan District, to the Mysore Commissioner in Mysore.

"With reference to your letter No.C.511 dated the 10th November 1922 calling for a detailed report with the connected papers in the appeal petition of Pandit Tirumalachar, archak of the Sri Chennigaraya devaru and Anjaneya temples at Kerlapur, Arkalgud Taluk, appealing against this office order placing the archak under suspension for two years, I have the honor to forward herewith the entire record connected with the subject. The facts of the case are embodied in this office order dated the 30th August 1922 (Photo) No.27."

"Copy".

K Iyengar

Deputy Commissioner.

D.V.

Muz 4]

SUBJECT .....

.....

.....

Diary No. of letter replied to 1545

Section Muz

File No. 21-2

Serial No. 4

Muzrai Secretariat

( )

, *the* 192 .

No. 24 11/ One same file

Date of issue 3/3/23

To

The Insp. Comr

Signed by V D C Subbarayappa

Sir,

Adverting to your letter No. C. 514 Dy 31-1-923 relating to the appeal petition of Pandit Srinivasachar, Archaka of Sri Srinivasa Perumal and Anjaneya temples at Keralapura Hobli of Gubbi Taluk, against the Dy. Comr's order placing the

over.

Cover 1/3/23

en pension for 2 years,

I am directed to request
to be furnished with information
on the points noted below:—

(1) When did the theft take place
in the Srinivasa Perumal temple?
(2) What were the things stolen
and what was their value?
(3) Who are the office holders in the temple,
and when was application made to
make good the loss?
(4) Is application made the
Sanadi Pujari of the Srinivasa
temple?
(5) Have three months of the
sanction of this temple
objected to his continuance
in office, and have they agreed
to pay him compensation for
his removal? and
(6) How long has petr been
practising Ayurveda and how
long has he been an Archak?
(2) The records are sent for ref.
and re-turn.

I have &c.

Rec-

List of enclosures.

Copied by

Examined by

WD 0563—GPB—2,500—27-7 22

No. C.514 9 8 1923 Office of the Muzrai Commissioner in Mysore.
are confile

Dated Bangalore, 26th July 1923.
28

From,

K. Chandy, Esquire., B.A.,
Muzrai Commissioner in Mysore,
Bangalore.

GEN. & REV. DEPT. 30 JUL 1923 MUZRAI

9136

211-22-5

To

T. E. Jayarama Aiyar, Esquire., B.A., B.L.,
Secretary to the Government of His Highness
the Maharaja of Mysore, Revenue Department.

AV 30/7

Sir,

Adverting to your letter 2411/Muz.211-22-4 dated 3rd March --- 1923 calling for certain particulars in connection with the appeal -- petition of Pandit Tirmalachar, Archak, of Sri Srinivasa Devaru and -- Anjaneya temples at Neralapur, Arkalgud Taluk, I have the honor to forward herewith the records received with the Hassan Deputy ----- Commissioner's letter No.H.C.248-22 dated 16th July 1923 copy of --- which is herein enclosed and to state that the report contains --- answers to each of the items referred to.

The appeal petition received with your letter is also enclosed.

I have the honor to be,
Sir,
Your most obedient servant,
K Chandy
Muzrai Commissioner.

mk

Letter No.H.C.248-22 dated 16th July 1923 from the Deputy Commissioner, Shimoga District, to the Muzrai Commissioner in Mysore.

With reference to your letter No.C.514 dated 13th March 1923 forwarding a copy of letter No.2411/Muz.211-22-4 dated 3rd March -- 1923 from the Revenue Secretary to Government calling for further particulars regarding the petition of archak Tirumalachar, Kerlapura, Arkalgud Taluk, appealing against this office order re: his suspensi from service for two years, I have the honor to state as follows:--

1. The theft of articles in the Srinivasa Devaru Temple is reported to have taken place on 10th May 1921 and the archak (the appellant) brought the same to the notice of the Taluk authorities on 14th September 1921 i.e. after a delay of four months.

2. The articles stolen are enumerated in the margin and their value is estimated at Rs.85-8-0.

1. Three silver kiritas.
2. Silver hasta.
3. Two pieces of silver kavacha
4. Silver chamara
5. Silver fan.
6. Silver katihasta
7. Copper Kirita.
8. Copper shank and chakra.
9. Four sadis.

3. The archak is the only ---- servant of the temple. Three dharmadarsis were appointed to supervise the affairs of the -- temple and out of them only one is surviving. No orders have -- yet been issued to the appellant to make good the loss of the articles.

4. The Amildar reports that the appellant is not the baraward pujari of the temple. From the mahazar of the villagers of --- Kerlapur, it is seen that on the death of one Thimmarasaiya, about 15 years back, Tirumalachar, the appellant took up the service in the temple from the year 1908.

5. Excluding 24 persons who are Veerashaivas, 27 persons, most of them being branmans and staunch devotees of the temple, pray for the removal of the appellant from the archakship, while 25 persons who are non-brahmins desire the continuance of the appellant as archak. The Amildar reports that these 25 persons are illiterate

ill defate and do not evince any kind of interest in the affai the temple. The villagers who object to the continuance of the appellant as pujari are not agreeable to pay him any compensation for his removal on the ground that the appeallant is neither the -- barawardar pujari nor possesses unimpeachable character.

6. The appellant says that he has been practising Ayurvedic from a long time, while the villagers say that he has been practising it for the last 8 years. According to the version of the Dharmadarsis, the appellant has been the archak of the temple for the last 15 years.

7. The connected records accompany."

"C o p y"

for Muzrai Commissioner.

26/7/38.

Muz 4]

SUBJECT.....

Diary No. of letter replied to _____

Section Muz.

File No. 21-72

Serial No. 56

Muzrai Secretariat

( )

, the 192 .

No. 542

Duefile

Date of issue 22-10-23

To

The Muz. Comr

Signed by Jns T. Ramaiyar Sri

Adverting To correspondence ending with your letter No 136 Dy 28-7-1923 Reporting on the appeal petition of Pandit Srirama Packer, Archaka of Sri Chennakesava Swami and Anjaneyar

over.

temples at Keralahun,
Kalgus Taluk,
I am directed to state
that as this is only an
appeal against a
disciplinary order
of punishment
passed by the District Munsif Officer
you may yourself
entertain the appeal
and dispose of it. the same leaving the
aggrieved party to
(2) The record
appeal if he so chooses
is now returned,
for ~~reference~~ disposal.

I have etc.

Dec 29/8/23
Asst Secretary

Last of enclosures.

Copied l

Examined by

By

1/8/23

WD 0563—GPB—2,500—27-7-22